

vixra.org >

[Quantum Gravity
and String
Theory](#) >

viXra:1511.0036



Quantum Gravity and String Theory



Physical Review Letters Correspondence

Authors: [Nigel B. Cook](#), [Stanley G. Brown](#)

Email discussion with the editor of Physical Review Letters on 2 January 2003 over the mechanism of gravity (see <http://vixra.org/abs/1305.0012> for brief summary or <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> and related uploads to vixra for more detail). Notice that Stanley G. Brown, editor of PRL, makes a large number of unproved, misleading, speculative and false assertions in failing to publish the paper (which he falsely claims is speculative, suggesting he has not read it or checked the calculations made) and begins with the assertion that I have a doctorate, which is incorrect and proves that even my covering letter has not been read. When you exclude all the incorrect statements made by Stanley G. Brown, you are left with merely "Physical Review Letters does not, in general, publish papers on alternatives to currently accepted theories ..." This tells you a lot about the stagnation of quantum gravity in "peer" reviewed journals since 2003. These people are proved ignorant by their replies, and do not even read the letters to see whether authors have a PhD or not. So, given that error, why trust their judgement to censor the paper itself? There was a further exchange of emails with the associate editor over a longer period, in which the associate editor correctly called the mechanism "an extremely non-standard theory", but it turned out that instead of praising the new idea for its accurate prediction of the amount of dark energy two years before observation, what he really meant was that he only wanted spin-2 superstring theories of the failed Edward Witten variety that did not predict the observed dark energy.

Comments: 2 Pages.

Download: [PDF](#)

Submission history

[[v1](#)] 2015-11-03 16:23:05

Unique-IP document downloads: 0 times

Add your own feedback and questions here:

You are equally welcome to be positive or negative about any paper but please be polite. If you are being critical you must mention at least one specific error, otherwise your comment will be deleted as unhelpful.

**Nige Cook** • 2 minutes ago

There are further emails on internet archive at <https://archive.org/details/Ph...> of more detailed discussion with the associate editor of Physical Review Letters on 22 January 2003 over the mechanism of gravity (see <http://vixra.org/abs/1305.0012> for brief summary or <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> and related uploads to vixra for more detail). Once specious and otherwise false claims by Physical Review Letters are omitted, we are left with an email from the associate editor Richard Price which arrogantly and ignorantly declares:

“You are proposing a very nonstandard mechanism for gravity ... Your mechanism/model is highly nonstandard and, as such, needs very thorough justification. Physical Review Letters is not the appropriate journal for such a presentation.”

This last sentence basically terminates any possibility of publishing the facts in the PRL, regardless of the thoroughness of the presentation, because they state that the journal is not the place for a scientific revolution based on proved facts.

For the quantum gravity science which, therefore, PRL will not publish even in principle, please see: <http://vixra.org/abs/1111.0111> , <http://vixra.org/abs/1301.0187> , <http://vixra.org/abs/1301.0188> , <http://vixra.org/abs/1302.0004> , <http://vixra.org/abs/1304.0175> , <http://vixra.org/abs/1305.0012> and <http://vixra.org/abs/1305.0018>

^ | v • Edit • Reply • Share ›

**Niae Cook** • 27 minutes ago

[Contact](#) - [Disclaimer](#) - [Privacy](#) - [Funding](#)